DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 875 HE 002 930

AUTHOR Beeler, Kent O.
TITLE Characteristics of Selected Two-Year Institutions Undergoing Academic Extension: 1958-59 Through 1967-68.
INSTITUTION Eastern Michigan Univ., Ypsilanti.
PUB DATE [68]
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Planning; *Colleges; *Educational Change; *Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Junior Colleges; Transitional Schools; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

It has been alleged that 2-year colleges often seek transformation to a 4-year status. This survey reports on an analysis of institutional changes that have occurred in 72 junior colleges from 1958-59 through 1967-68. Institutional information is profiled on the basis of the following factors: (1) year of academic extension and location by state; (2) institutional control; (3) type of student body; (4) enrollment size; (5) academic calendar system; (6) presence or absence of regional accreditation; (7) year when the regionally accredited institutions first offered junior college work; (8) type of curricula represented on the 2-year campuses prior to academic extension; and (9) type of curricular adaptations accompanying changes to 4-year institutional status. A detailed discussion of these factors as related to the overall spectrum is presented as well as the actual statistical data. (Author/HS)

ED 061875

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CHARACTERISTICS OF SELECTED TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS UNDERGOING ACADEMIC EXTENSION: 1958-59 THROUGH 1967-68

KENT D. BEELER EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Recent legislation involving either the establishment or reorganization of a two-year college system has been passed in several states. Accompanying the establishment of post-secondary institutions is the frequent accusation that the junior college[1] is a very unstable institution. This newest segment of higher education has been confronted with the allegation that it often seeks transformation to a four-year status.

It was assumed that, this investigation into the recent activity of two-year colleges in the area of academic extension would be of interest and value to boards of trustees, educational agencies and professional organizations, and the students, faculty, and administrative personnel involved with the community college movement in the United States. To arrive at a conclusion about the occurrence of vertical extension of such institutions, the following questions were posed: Has a rapid expansion of two-year college elevation taken place in the past ten-year period? Do such factors as type of institutional control, student enrollment, and curriculum affect the possibility of academic elongation? Is the junior college a transitional institution? In essence, can the statement be made that the two-year institution is a permanent segment of higher education. These and similar aspects of upward extension of selected two-year colleges will be acknowledged in this article.

Description of the survey

This survey reports on an analysis of two-year institutional changes that have occurred in 72 junior colleges during 1958-59 through 1967-68. Institutional information has been profiled on the basis of these factors: (1) year of academic extension and location by state, (2) institutinnal control, (3) type of student body, (4) enrollment size, (5) academic calendar system, (6) presence or absence of regional accreditation, (7) year when the regionally accredited institutions first offered junior college work, (8) type of curriculums represented on the two-year campuses

HE 002 930

prior to academic extension, and (9) type of curricular adaptations accompanying changes to four-year institutional status.

A larger number of two-year institutions in operation during the ten-year period would have been included if the criteria for selection had been extended to include all institutions, as listed in the United States Office of Education (USOE) directories, that once offered two years but less than four years of academic work.[2] Institutions not commonly included among typical junior colleges--Bible institutes, seminaries, other single-purpose professional and technical schools, and proprietary institutions--were excluded from this survey. It is also important to note that no attempt was made to identify, determine, or analyze the reasons underlying the changes in academic status of the profiled institutions.

Institutions included in this study were identified from the annual issues, 1958-59 through 1967-68, of the Education Directory, Part 3: Higher Education. The directory sections listing "institutions reclassified" were reviewed and it was determined what colleges met the selective criteria used in the study. Another research source of institutions undergoing upward extension is the annual Junior College Directory prepared by the American Association of Junior Colleges from returned questionnaires mailed to member institutions. Originally, that directory and the 5th, 6th, and 7th editions of the American Council on Education's American Junior Colleges were to have been used as cross references with the USOE directories. Since the information for the two professional associations' publications is secured either from voluntary mailed returns or from referral reporting by educational agencies and departments, incomplete reporting prohibited such verification. To provide consistency in the survey, USOE directories were then used as the sole source of institutional information.

The USOE directory makes a policy of continuing a two-year classification for an institution until it has conferred baccalaureate degrees, not when the institution announces the change and has begun offering a higher level of instruction. Due to the possible influence of the pending higher curricular offerings affecting the kind of

student body, college enrollment, and perhaps the academic calendar, information on the qualifying institutions was gathered from the preceding directory, e.g., profile data on institutions changing from a two-year status as of 1967-68 was collected from the 1966-67 issue.

Review of literature and related research

A search of the pertinant literature revealed several observations, surveys and studies related to the process of academic extension. Schultz and Stickler[3] have pointed out the phenomenon of vertical extension of collegiate-level academic programs and that such a process is not restricted to the community college level, although most of such reporting in the professional journals does relate to two-year colleges becoming four-year institutions. Still, there is a dearth of available literature on the two-year institutional academic shifts. Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson[4] in 1965 stated that a weakness in state legislation is "the lack of a decision regarding the transformation of two-year colleges to four-year colleges." They suggested that without definite action on this question political maneuvering would result at each session of the legislature. Brumbaugh[5] wrote in a 1966 research monograph that "the reasons for the changes from junior to senior college status have not been studied systematically." During the same year, Morrison[6] made the statement that "possibly no subject in administrative organization is more deserving of close and careful study than the criteria needed for change from two-year to four-year colleges."

Eells,[7] in an unfinished study conducted in 1962, recorded the fact that almost 400 two-year colleges were established in the 1940's and 1950's. Of this total eight percent, or 32 institutions, all privately controlled, had become four-year campuses. Two articles by Eells and Martorana[8] published in 1957 relate closely to the subject under review. In analyzing the number of junior colleges that became senior colleges during the span of 1945-46 through 1955-56, the co-authors found that 91 junior colleges, approximately eight per year, became senior institutions. Eells and Martorana[9] also dealt with an analysis of curricular changes which occurred in the institutional transition. Hughes[10] reported on seven church-related colleges that made an academic

extension during the period of 1955 to 1966. He concentrated on the impact of curricular changes in these transcending institutions. Bill[11] presented selected data spanning the years 1946-1967 dealing exclusively with curricular shifts in upward extending two year colleges.

Reynolds[12] cited the period elapsing between publication of the 5th and 6th editions of American Junior Colleges (1960-1964) as having produced 31 junior colleges that became four-year colleges. Of that number six were independent junior colleges and 13 were church affiliated; the remainder were under public support. Morrison[13] examined data from the Education Directory and found that 81 of the 656 two-year colleges in existence during the three-year period of 1962-1965 had been reclassified as four-year institutions; all but four were privately-controlled colleges.

Brown,[14] in writing about the manpower outlook for the 1960's, and Hollis,[15] in speaking of facilities for higher education, both supported the idea of vertical extension of community colleges on the grounds of national needs. Smith[16] contended that two-year institutions make the change in order to better serve the educational needs of their students.

McConnell,[17] contended that the process of upward extension is largely motivated by a desire for professional status and prestige. He acknowledged the well known "hierarchy of education prestige and value" in which "their seems to be some kind of 'pecking order' of public prestige." Horn[18] expressed the opinion that pressures of junior college faculties "to achieve greater academic respectability" was an important contributing factor in bringing about the transition of junior colleges to senior college status. Medsker[19] in 1960 reported a survey of the attitudes of a nation-wide sample of faculty members at 74 previously two-year colleges concerning the conversion of their institution to four-year status. Contrary to Horn's contention, almost two of three faculty members would have preferred to have their institution remain as a two-year college. Montgomery[20] found that an even smaller proportion of faculty members in Florida community colleges would accept the idea of seeing their institutions become a senior college.

Merrill,[21] using Jacksonville University (Florida) as a case study in 1957, attempted to establish criteria for the successful transition of a private junior college into a private senior-level institution. Roueche,[22] in his study of Mars Hill College (North Carolina), conducted a case study of this private denominational institution that made the upward transition in 1962 to a senior liberal arts college. He found that adequate financial support appeared to be a fundamental requirement in any such attempted transition. More recently, Gott[23] sought to determine to what extent the two-year college founctions continued to be performed in the new academic format of two colleges and identified factors that seem to mitigate for and against continuation of these functions. Schultz and Roueche,[24] in a 1966 observation, reminded other junior colleges that were contemplating transition to senior college status to take heed of the case study conducted on one southern institution, and also reminded them of the adage--"all that glitters is not gold."

The most comprehensive study to date of vertical extension of institutions of higher learning was conducted by Schultz and Stickler.[25] Included with their analysis of all levels of institutions undergoing the vertical extension process was identification of aspects of institutional operation that may have been significant in the decision and in its subsequent success. The findings of their pilot study covered the 11-year period of 1953-54 through 1963-64, during which 319 institutions were identified as having initiated academic extensions. Included in that total were 72 junior colleges of which 11 were public, 23 independent, and 38 church-related institutions.

The preceding review of the professional writing suggest a growing awareness of the need to study the seemingly perpetual process of upward gravitation in institutions of higher learning. There likely is no one set of guidelines and policies concerning academic elevation which can be applied to all institutions in all states. However, the need for an inclusive, carefully designed, systematic appraisal of such junior college activity is readily apparent as rapidly growing populations and demands for additional four-year college opportunities create pressures for an expansion of curricular activity at the upper-division level.

Analysis of two-year colleges undergoing academic extension

Table 1 deals with the classification of the 72 selected two-year institutions included in this ten-year survey by academic year and location by state.(insert Table 1) A range of three to nine two-year colleges could be observed annually in terms of increases in upward extension until the final year of the period covered by this survey. The highest incidence occurred in 1967-68 with 18, and the lowest in 1960-61 with three. On a geographic basis, New York and North Carolina with seven institutional changes each and Missouri with six led the other states. In all, 29 different states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands were involved in at least one two-year college reclassification. The highest number of institutions affected by academic extension in a single state during a calendar year was three. North Carolina was involved in reclassification of junior colleges during five of the last ten years. However, more than one-half of the geographic units involved contributed just one institution during the period surveyed.

Table 2 is an analysis of the selected two-year institutions that undertook academic expansion during the 1958-59 through 1967-68 period by (1) type of institutional control, (2) type of student body, (3) enrollment category, and (4) academic calendar. (insert Table 2)

(1) Type of institutional control. The number of transformed institutions under denominational auspices almost doubled the number under independent and state sponsorship (all public institutions both under state and local control were included under one heading). Although the public institutions were involved less than church-affiliated colleges in upward extension, it must be remembered that state-sponsored institutions were involved more than independent colleges and also enrolled a higher proportion of students than both non-public college types. No more than three two-year institutions under independent control were affected during any single year, while as many as seven church-affiliated colleges and eight state-controlled colleges were involved in a similar calendar period.

(2) Type of student body. In excess of two of three institutions involved in vertical extension had a coeducational enrollment on their campuses. However, the number of coeducational institutions involved was in proportion to the percentage breakdown of all coeducational and single-sex two-year institutions operating in the United States. The fewest number of institutions involved had all-male enrollments. Since seminaries were deleted from the roster of institutions studied, this may account for the noticeably small number of all-male colleges represented. The all-female colleges were involved in more than one of every five institutional changes in academic classification.

(3) Enrollment category. Just more than three-fourths of the reviewed institutions had an enrollment of less than 1,000 students. Also to be noted is that 33 of the 72 institutions studied, or forty-five percent, had fewer than 500 students enrolled. The highest proportion of colleges with low enrollments were privately-controlled, primarily church-related institutions. Only five institutions, public or private, had enrolled in excess of 2,000 students on their campuses.

(4) Academic calendar. Nearly eight of every ten institutions operated on the semester calendar system at the time of their involvement in academic elongation. About 17 percent of the revised institutions had conducted their academic programs on the quarter system while only three two-year colleges that underwent curricular transformation operated on the trimester calendar. The percentage of involved institutions with a semester system was in proportion to the national distribution of two-year colleges with such an academic calendar operation. The same distribution held true for the former two-year institutions that operated on the quarter and trimester academic calendar systems.

Table 3 reflects on an annual basis the geographic location of the accredited 50 junior colleges by the six regional accrediting associations. The 23 remaining institutions without regional accreditation are reported by the years in which they initiated academic elevation. (insert Table 3)

The geographic distribution of the accredited two-year institutions, by the boundaries of the regional accrediting associations, revealed that a significant concentration existed in the Southern Association with 22 institutions represented; the large area covered by the North Central Association was in representation next with 15 elevated institutions. Only two colleges within the Northwest Association were included, and the other three regional associations all had either three or four cases of two-year colleges seeking extensions. This distribution was not unusual since the most prominent type of institution affected by institutional gravitation was the church-affiliated college and a sizeable number of such institutions are located in the southern part of the United States.

Equally important, however, is the fact that more than 30 percent of the total involved colleges with gravitational desires were not accredited by any regional association. There was not a significant number of such institutions in any similar geographic pattern however. This category of the unaccredited institutions did provide an educational program with some degree of academic standards which allowed them to be included in the USOE directories. Generally, that recognition was given by the respective state departments of education or by a state university. Still it remains that a significant number of institutions without the academic recognition that accompanies regional accreditation sought to expand their curriculums even though their two-year academic programs may not have been of demonstrated quality or stability.

For the 50 regionally accredited two-year institutions included in this survey, the year in which junior college work was first organized was determined from past editions of the American Junior College. Table 4 provides categorization of the accredited junior colleges into calendar periods during which junior college instruction was begun. (insert Table 4)

Nearly one-half of these transitional institutions were organized for the two-year level of academic work during the decade of 1920-1929. This is not particularly surprising since the first growth period of two-year colleges in the United States was

during the early part of this century. Interestingly, only nine institutions affected were established prior to 1920, and only two of the transformed junior colleges were initiated after 1940. Two-thirds of the two-year colleges that underwent institutional metamorphosis were organized for junior college work during the twenty-year span of 1920-1939.

All instructional curriculums are classified by the USOE into eleven separate categories for purposes of entry into the directory. The various curriculums available on the campuses of the 72 selected institutions were analyzed both before and after the change in academic status. The curriculums prior to their revisions or expansions are shown in Table 5 by category and academic year. (insert Table 5)

From the original pattern of eight curriculums found in the two-year colleges, the conversion to four-year status did not affect the number of separate curricular classifications although it did affect the curricular classifications themselves. The following changes were made: (1) professional or technical, and terminal-occupational, and (2) liberal arts and general, with 1 or 2 professional schools at the four year level, were added and replaced (1) terminal-occupational (below bachelor's degree), and (2) professional or technical, and teacher preparatory, which were available at the sub-baccalaureate level.

At the two-year level of academic operation, it was found that more than four of every ten of the selected institutions were formerly in the category of liberal arts and general, and terminal-occupational. The classification of liberal arts and general, teacher preparatory, and terminal-occupational was the next most numerous two-year curriculum to undergo transformation. These two curriculums accounted for ~~66 2/3~~ just more than two-thirds percent of the curriculums that were affected in the institutional gravitations.

To draw a comparison of shifts in curricular emphasis, the academic offerings of the new four-year institutions were reviewed. Table 6 provides an analysis of the curriculums as they were affected by the revised academic programs in the two-year institutions. (insert Table 6)

The most popular new curriculum at the four-year level was liberal arts and general, teacher preparatory, and terminal-occupational and was initiated in more than one of every three newly revised institutions. The category of liberal arts and general, and terminal occupational was chosen by 18 institutions as the new or revised curricular format; the category of liberal arts and general, and teacher preparatory was selected or retained by 17 two-year colleges.

The general tendency in over 75 percent of the two-year colleges was to retain and expand the original curriculum in the process of implementing a four-year program. No particular curriculum for upward extension was favored by either the public or non-public institutions.

Discussion

A significant portion of the publicly-controlled institution's budget, as compared to a non-public two-year college's, is appropriated from tax moneys. Thus, a state-assisted institution can more successfully anticipate the source of income necessary to implement a new or expanded academic program. Unless a church-related or independent two-year college is already in receipt of a substantial endowment, can rely on its tuition income to cover a significant portion of the instructional costs, has an alumni with demonstrated loyalty, and/or has a "financial angel" in the wings, the likelihood of its successfully implementing a four-year program, economically speaking, is at best a risky one.

Increased library holdings, a more qualified and specialized faculty, more professional administrators (thus increasing the appearance of Parkinson's Law[26]), a probable lower teacher-student ratio at the upper-division level, and some expansion and rehabilitation of the physical plant are all obvious factors that accompany the gravitational process. Chambers[27] estimates that unit costs in the upper division are necessarily about twice as high as in the lower division. He continues by familiarizing us with the maxim, "Every new enterprise is an island of high costs during its first year of existence." Serious attention to such economic items as those mentioned

here needs to be given by all institutions considering academic expansions.

Still, exterior and interior forces are at work to keep the junior colleges conscious that some constituencies would like to see an academic extension. Enterprising political officials, labor leaders, leading local citizens, and well-meaning business and industrial leaders have helped create the interest in expanding a two-year institution to a baccalaureate degree granting college. Interior pressures from students wishing to continue their education while residing at home and holding a part-time job, along with parental concern about financing the last two years of the bachelor's degree (with the possible concurrent room and board costs and even non-resident tuition) contribute to the pressure to add an upper-division program.

Many key college administrators share the ambition to be part of a four-year institution. Their well-intentioned aspirations are many times unconscious ones but are still present and a part of the existing pressure. Department heads and other faculty members are aware of the different academic prestige that accompanies an instructional assignment on a four-year campus. Boards of trustees are confronted with expressions from influential citizens and alumni concerning the desire, and perhaps legitimate need, for an expanded academic program in the local college. In short, many constituencies feel that a more complete identification with higher education can be achieved when a two-year institution becomes a senior college.

In light of the economic factors and the variety of internal and external constituencies that are to be considered in a decision about an institution participating in academic elevation, an institution-wide concensus needs to be reached. Almost all two-year colleges currently need to re-evaluate their institutional objectives and goals in relation to their role in the structural hierarchy of American higher education. It remains that a change in institutional academic format may possibly be a great disservice to the constituencies involved, the community area, and higher education itself.

Summary and conclusions

The purpose of this study was to provide an indication of the extent to which selected two-year colleges have become four-year institutions. The descriptive institutional data were obtained from the annual issues of the USOE Education Directory; Part 3: Higher Education for the years 1958-59 through 1967-68. The survey conducted has resulted in several observations, some more conclusive than others. First will be included a response to the three primary questions concerning stability, characteristics, and rate of change of two-year colleges as raised earlier in the article.

(1) Do junior colleges actively seek upward extension? No substantial evidence was found to support the frequently expressed apprehension that the establishment of two-year colleges will necessarily lead to a desire to initiate a four-year baccalaureate degree granting program. In only one year, 1967-68, did more than two percent of all two-year colleges eligible for inclusion in the survey seek elevation to a senior college status. Thus, it can hardly be insinuated that the junior college, by its very nature, is a transitional institution with little stability in its academic format. (2) Do selected institutional characteristics contribute to the propensity to seek academic elongation? As would be expected, due in part to legislation or state regulations, fewer publicly-supported community colleges extended upward as contrasted with the percentage of potential church-related and independent two-year colleges involved. In some instances the change to a four-year college was an integrated part of the original development plan of upward extending institutions. This is particularly true of state-controlled which many times are affected as part of a state-wide master plan for higher education. A discernable trend regarding institutional control is that most future extensions can be expected to occur in the two-year church-related institutions. Junior colleges under that sponsorship more actively sought vertical extension as compared to independent or state-supported institutions. It was also witnessed that an inverse relationship existed between the enrollment size and upward gravitation. That is to say, the smaller the enrollment the more likely

the possibility of a future expansion of academic offerings to a four-year level regardless of the type of institutional control. The type of student body and academic calendar system present at the time of the announced shift in academic programming were represented in proportion to the prevalence of those characteristics at all two-year institutions. Two-year colleges located in the Southern Association were more involved in vertical extension than any of the other five accrediting associations regions. However, the institutions studied were just as likely to have received no regional accreditation at the time of the decision to implement a curricular transformation. The largest number of the accredited two-year institutions affected first offered the junior college level instruction during the early part of this century, 1920-1929. No particular curricular offering was found more likely to be represented in institutions that sought academic elongation. In most instances, over 75 percent, the new four-year college retained its previous academic offerings and added related areas of study.

(3) Has the number of affected two-year institutions increased annually in the past decade? Concerning the rapidity of upward extension, it was found that an average of fewer than eight two year institutions yearly sought a change in academic status, or a range of three to nine junior colleges annually except for 1967-68 when 18 institutions were affected. That rate of annual change in institutional format on the part of community colleges can hardly be described as showing a significant increase in academic extension during the 1958-59 through 1967-68 period.

In conclusion, it is beyond the observational powers of this investigator to suggest that the phenomenon of academic extension of two-year programs will occur on any rapid or extended basis in the coming decade. It is recognized that some junior colleges will seek an academic elongation but that many of these, particularly the publicly-supported institutions, will be following an earlier agreed upon gravitational design. In response to the overriding theme in this article, it is concluded that the two-year college is, in effect, a permanent segment of higher education.

Table 1: Two-year institutions by academic year and location by state through 1967-68

State	58-59	59-60	60-61	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67	67-68	Total
Arkansas	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
California	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Colorado	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Dist. of Col.	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Florida	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Georgia	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5
Hawaii	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Idaho	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Iowa	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Kansas	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kentucky	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Louisiana	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	3
Massachusetts	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Michigan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Minnesota	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Missouri	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	6
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
New Hampshire	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
New Jersey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
New York	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	7
North Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	1	7
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Texas	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Totals	4	5	3	9	4	8	9	7	5	18	72

Table 2: Descriptive characteristics of two-year institutions--type of control, type of student body, enrollment category, and academic calendar, 1958-59 through 1967-68

Institutions	Total	58-59	59-60	60-61	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67	67-68
Type of control											
public	21	2	0	0	2	0	1	2	3	3	8
independent	16	0	1	1	2	3	2	2	0	2	3
church	35	2	3	3	5	1	5	5	4	0	7
Type of student body											
men	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
women	17	1	2	1	4	1	4	1	1	0	2
coeducational	51	3	3	2	5	2	4	7	6	4	15
Enrollment category											
Under 500	33	3	4	0	3	2	7	4	2	2	6
500-999	22	1	0	3	3	2	1	3	2	2	5
1,000-1,499	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2
1,500-1,999	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
Over 2,000	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	2
Academic calendar											
semester	57	3	4	4	9	3	8	5	5	4	12
trimester	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
quarter	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	5

Table 3: Two-year institutions by regional accrediting association and institutions without regional accreditation, 1958-59 through 1967-68

Regional association	Total	58-59	59-60	60-61	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67	67-68
Southern	22	3	0	2	2	0	2	1	3	3	6
North Central	15	0	2	0	3	0	1	3	2	0	4
New England	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
Middle States	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
Western	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Northwest	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
No regional accreditation	22	1	2	1	3	3	3	2	0	1	6

Table 4: Year junior college work established at/regionally accredited two-year institutions, 1958-59 through 1967-68

Span of years	Number of institutions
Before 1920	9
1920-1929	23
1930-1939	10
1940-1949	6
After 1950	2
Total	50

Table 5: Curriculums in two-year institutions prior to academic elevation, 1958-59 through 1967-68

Curriculums	Total	58-59	59-60	60-61	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67	67-68
terminal-occupational (below bachelor's degree)	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
liberal arts and general	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
liberal arts and general, and terminal-occupational	30	0	1	2	5	0	3	3	4	3	9
primarily teacher preparatory	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
liberal arts and general, and teacher preparatory	11	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	0	0	3
liberal arts and general, teacher preparatory, and terminal-occupational	19	4	2	1	1	0	2	2	3	1	3
professional or technical	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
professional or technical, and teacher preparatory	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Table 6: Revised or expanded curriculums in two-year institutions, after academic elevation, 1958-59 through 1967-68

Curriculums	Total	58-59	59-60	60-61	61-61	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67	67-68
liberal arts and general	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1
liberal arts and general, and terminal-occupational	18	0	0	3	4	0	2	1	2	0	6
primarily teacher preparatory	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
liberal arts and general, and teacher preparatory	17	0	1	0	2	1	2	2	2	0	7
liberal arts and general, teacher preparatory, and terminal-occupational	25	4	3	0	1	1	2	4	3	3	4
professional or technical,	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
professional or technical, and terminal-occupational	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
liberal arts and general with 1 or 2 professional schools	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0

Footnotes

1. The terms "two-year college," "junior college," and "community college" are used interchangeably in the article. No attempt has been made to distinguish between the three institutional descriptions.

2. The criteria established for listing of institutions in the annual directory compiled by the USOE includes these two items: (1) institutions accredited or approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency, a state department of education, or by a state university, are eligible for inclusion; (2) institutions not meeting requirements of criterion 1 are eligible for inclusion if their credits have been or are accepted as if coming from an accredited institution by not fewer than three accredited institutions.

3. Schultz, Raymond E. and Stickler, W. Hugh, "Vertical Extension of Academic Programs in Institutions of Higher Education," The Educational Record 46:231-241, Summer, 1965.

4. Blocker, Clyde E, Plummer, Robert H., and Richardson, Richard C. Jr., The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965, p. 102.

5. Brumbaugh, A. J., Establishing New Senior Colleges, Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board Research Monograph No. 12, 1966, p. 20.

6. Morrison, D. G., "So You Plan to Change Your Junior College to a Four-Year Institution?" Phi Delta Kappan 18:442-443, April, 1966.

7. Ibid, p. 442.

8. Eells, Walter C. and Martorana, S. V., "Curricular Changes in 2-Year Colleges That Became 4-Year Colleges," Higher Education 13:149-153, April, 1957.

9. Eells, Walter C. and Martorana, S. V., "Do Junior Colleges Become Four-Year Colleges?" Higher Education 13:110-115, February, 1957.

10. Hughes, Ray H., "The Transition of Church-Related Junior Colleges to Senior Colleges With Implications for Lee College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966.

11. Bill, Daniel J., "Curricular Change in Upward Extending Two-Year Colleges," unpublished paper, School of Education, Indiana University, May, 1968, 20 pp.

12. Reynolds, James W., The Junior College, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965, p. 100.

13. Morrison, op. cit., p. 442.

14. Brown, Newell, "The Manpower Outlook for the 1960's: Its Implications for Higher Education," Higher Education 16:3-6, December, 1959.

15. Hollis, Ernest V., "Facilities for Higher Education," Higher Education 16:3-5, January, 1960.

16. Smith, Roderick J., "An Analysis of the Transition from the Junior College Program to That of a Four-Year Liberal Arts Institution at Spring Arbor Junior College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1961.

17. McConnell, T. R., A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962, p. 64.

18. Horn, Francis H., "Future of the Junior College," Educational Forum 17:427-435, May, 1953.

19. Medsker, Leland L., The Junior College: Progress and Prospect, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960, p. 192.

20. Montgomery, Douglas M., "An Analysis of Faculty Acceptance of and Commitment to the Stated Mission of the Florida Community Junior College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Flordia State University, 1962.

21. Morrill, Helen T., "Criteria for the Development of a Private Two-Year College into a Private Four-Year Liberal Arts College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1961.

22. Roueche, John E., Jr., "An Analysis of the Transition of a Junior College into a Four-Year Liberal Arts Institution: A Case Study," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Flordia State University, 1964.

23. Gott, Richard, Junior College into 4-Year College: Rationale and Result in Two Institutions, Berkeley: University of California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1968, 78 pp.

24. Schultz, Raymond E. and Roueche, John E. Jr., 'All That Glitters...' in "Short Contributions," Journal of Higher Education 37:91-93, February, 1966.

25. Schultz and Stickler, op. cit.

26. The geometric expansion of administrative bureaucracy within an organization.

27. Chamber, Merritt M., Higher Education Who Pays? Who Gains? Financing Education Beyond the High School, Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1968, p. 197.

Bibliography

1. American Association of Junior Colleges, Junior College Directory, annual issues 1957-58 through 1967-68, Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges.

2. American Council on Education, American Junior College, 5th, 6th, and 7th Editions, Washington: American Council on Education.

3. Beeler, Kent D., "Upward Extension of Two-Year Institutions," unpublished paper, School of Education, Indiana University, January, 1968, 20 pp.

4. Bill, Daniel J., "Curricular Change in Upward Extending Two-Year Colleges," unpublished paper, School of Education, Indiana University, May, 1968, 20 pp.

5. Blocker, Clyde E., Plummer, Robert H., and Richarson, Richard C. Jr., The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965, 298 pp.

6. Brown, Newell, "The Manpower Outlook for the 1960's: Its Implications for Higher Education," Higher Education 16:3-6, December, 1959.

7. Brumbaugh, A. J., Establishing New Senior Colleges, Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board Research Monograph No. 12., 103 pp.

8. Chambers, Merritt M., Higher Education Who Pays? Who Gains? Financing Education Beyond the High School, Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1968, 302 pp.

9. Conley, William H., "Recent Significant Curricular Changes," Journal of Higher Education 7:453-458, May, 1937.

10. Dawson, Eugene E., "A Junior College Changes Status," Educational Record 41:208-214, July, 1960.

11. Eells, Walter C. and Martorana, S. V., "Do Junior Colleges Become Four-Year Colleges?" Higher Education 13:110-115, February, 1957.

12. Eells, Walter C. and Martorana, S. V., "Curricular Changes in 2-Year Colleges That Became 4-Year Colleges," Higher Education 13:149-153, April, 1957.

13. Frick, Herman L., "A Study of Some Elements for Consideration When Establishing or Expanding a Junior College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, undated.

14. Gott, Richard, Junior College into 4-Year College: Rationale and Result in Two Institutions, Berkeley: University of California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1968, 78 pp.

15. Greenleaf, Walter J., Junior Colleges, Washington: United States Office of Education, Bulletin No. 3, 1936.

16. Hollis, Ernest V., "Facilities for Higher Education," Higher Education 16:3-5, January, 1960.

17. Horn, Francis H., "Future of the Junior College," Educational Forum 17:427-435, May, 1953.

18. Hughes, Ray H., "The Transition of Church-Related Junior Colleges to Senior Colleges With Implications for Lee College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966.

19. McConnell, T. R., A Gene ral Pattern for American Public Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962, pp. 427-435.

20. Medsker, Leland L., The Junior College: Progress and Prospect, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960, 367 pp.

21. Morrill, Helen T., "Criteria for the Development of a Private Two-Year College into a Private Four-Year Liberal Arts College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1961.

22. Montgomery, Douglas M., "An Analysis of Faculty Acceptance of and Commitment to the Stated Mission of the Florida Community Junior College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1962.

23. Pierce, O. L. and Carpenter, W. W., "Changes in the Number of Junior Colleges and Changes in Their Organization from 1930-31 to 1936-37," Junior College Journal 7: 501-503, May, 1937.

24. Reynolds, James W., The Junior College, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965, 111pp.

25. Roueche, John E. Jr., "An Analysis of the Transition of a Junior College into a Four-Year Liberal Arts Institution: A Case Study," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1964.

26. Russel, John H., "Why Fourteen Colleges Changed Their Names," Junior College Journal 31:248-249, January, 1961.

27. Salwak, Stanley, "Reasons for the Permanent Closing of Junior Colleges in the United States," Journal of Educational Research 50:543-549, March, 1957.

28. Schultz, Raymond E. and Roueche, John E. Jr., 'All That Glitters...' in "Short Contributions," Journal of Higher Education 37:91-93, February, 1966.

29. Schultz, Raymond E. and Stickler, W. Hugh, "Vertical Extension of Academic Programs in Institutions of Higher Education," The Educational Record 46:231-241, Summer, 1965.

30. Smith, Roderick J., "An Analysis of the Transition from the Junior College Program to That of a Four-Year Liberal Arts Institution at Spring Arbor Junior College," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1961.

31. United States Office of Education, Education Directory, Part 3: Higher Education, annual issues 1957-58 through 1967-68, Washington: Government Printing Office.